

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration in view of the previous amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 22 is amended to correct an obvious typographical error. Currently, claims 14-19 and 22 are under review, claims 1-13, 20 and 21 having been withdrawn as a result of the June 25, 2008 election of species requirement. Claims 14 and 22 are independent.

The Office Action rejects claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 22 is amended to correct an obvious typographical error.

The Office Action rejects claims 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,955 to Shibata; and rejects claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shibata in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059383 to Katsuda. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 14 is directed to a fax data transmission device. A first storing unit is operable to store fax data and an identifier for identifying the fax data in correspondence with each other. A second storing unit is operable to store information showing a correspondence between an original destination of the fax data and a send information destination. The send information destination is a destination of send information which includes the identifier and a notification that the fax data identified by the identifier is going to be sent. A notifying unit is operable to send the send information to the send information destination corresponding to the original destination of the fax data with reference to the information stored in the second storing unit. A receiving unit is operable to receive destination information

for specifying a destination to which the fax data should actually be sent, as a reply to the send information. A sending unit is operable to send the fax data to the destination specified by the destination information.

The Office Action identifies the first e-mail service unit 16 as corresponding to the claimed second storing unit. As disclosed in Shibata, at column 13, the paragraph beginning at line 54, after the first e-mail service unit 16 performs the transmission of e-mail with an attachment of image data, the first e-mail service unit 16 controls the third e-mail service unit 18 to send the e-mail transmission notice to the local facsimile apparatus 6. As shown in Fig. 6 of Shibata, none of these notifications relate to a notification that fax data identified by an identifier is going to be sent.

The Office Action identifies the receiving status manager 11 as corresponding to the claimed receiving unit. However, as disclosed in Shibata, at the paragraph beginning at line 5 of column 8, an operator inputs through the console unit to designate the local facsimile apparatus 6 from among various local communications terminals registered in the local terminal number 31 of the local terminal information list 30 of the local terminal registration memory 12. The facsimile main controller 10 reads a corresponding e-mail address. As disclosed at the paragraph beginning at line 20 of column 6, the transmission/receiving status manager 11 maintains various kinds of status information related to the transmission and receiving operations for both facsimile and e-mail. When the third e-mail service unit 18 sends an e-mail transmission notice to the local facsimile apparatus 6, the transmission/receiving status manager holds the status information that the e-mail is sent.

It is unclear what the receiving status manager has to do with the Examiner's cited disclosure of Shibata at column 2, lines 50-55, nor does the receiving status manager seem to relate to specifying a fax destination. Further, logically, because in Shibata the e-mail with the image data is sent before the e-mail notification, it is difficult to see how Shibata can disclose a receiving unit operable to receive destination information for specifying a destination to which fax data should be sent as a reply to send information as in claim 14.

Independent claim 22 is distinguishable over Shibata for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 14.

Katsuda does not overcome the deficiencies of the Shibata reference.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above as well as for the individual features they recite.

Prompt and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested. Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC



By: _____

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47260

Date: January 23, 2009

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620